

P E R I O D I C A L D O O R
G E N E R A L L I B R A R Y
U N I V . O F M I C H .

MAR 12 1930

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50. Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXIII, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1930

WHOLE NO. 628

To be published in the spring

THIRD LATIN BOOK

B. L. ULLMAN

Professor of Latin in the
University of Chicago

NORMAN E. HENRY

Head of the Latin Department,
Peabody High School, Pittsburgh

DORRANCE S. WHITE

Assistant Professor of Latin
in the University of Iowa

In content as in all other factors this sequel to the Ullman and Henry textbooks for the first and second years of Latin study will carry on their high traditions. It will conform to the Report of the Classical Investigation, meet the College Entrance Examination Board requirements, and measure up to the finest standards of progressive Schools everywhere. In contrast to the traditional course in Cicero, the Third Latin Book offers selections not only from Cicero but from many other Latin writers, chosen for the double purpose of developing skill in the language and of developing appreciation of the life and letters of the Romans.

This new book will be another addition to the Macmillan Classical Series, under the general editorship of B. L. Ullman.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York Boston Chicago Atlanta Dallas San Francisco



***In Press---a New
Bimillennial Edition
of VIRGIL***

EASY, interesting, and beautifully illustrated, this new edition of the widely-used Greenough-Kittredge-Jenkins Virgil will interest many teachers.

IT includes the first six books of the Aeneid, more than enough material for the first half-year to permit choice, and over 1800 lines of selections from Ovid (*Metamorphoses*, *Fasti*, *Tristia*, *Heroides*), Horace (*Odes*), Catullus, Tibullus, and Virgil (*Georgics*).

IT thereby meets the new requirements for entrance into college which, based on the recommendations of the Report of the Classical Investigation, permit the reading of poets other than Virgil in a half of the fourth year.

Ginn and Company *Boston* *New York*
Chicago *Atlanta* *Dallas* *Columbus* *San Francisco*

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIII, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1930

WHOLE NO. 628

THE INFLUENCE OF ISOCRATES'S POLITICAL DOCTRINES ON SOME FOURTH CENTURY MEN OF AFFAIRS¹

Lest the political teaching of Isocrates and its influence on his contemporaries should seem a very hackneyed theme, let it be remarked at once that the completely contradictory views expressed in two recent publications seem to make a reexamination of the evidence not only desirable but necessary. Here is the first citation:

...He <i. e. Isocrates> was undoubtedly an idealist who was far in advance of his age; but to deny that he had any shaping influence upon contemporary history is to impeach the judgment of antiquity. He exercised a strong influence through his school; he was an outstanding publicist whose writings were widely read throughout Greece; he was on terms of friendship with many of the leading men of his time; he was the chief advocate of the pan-Hellenic idea, and as such was the spokesman for a considerable group of thinking men....

Here is the second:

...He said nothing new; but he has the merit of having steadily preached for forty years a line of policy which he was perhaps first led to expound by the fact that it was simply the recognised staple of oratorical effort before a Panhellenic assembly.... But Isocrates preached most steadily (one can hardly say most effectively; for there is no evidence to show that his pamphlets exercised any effect); and he preached to the principalities and powers of his day—to Dionysius I and to Archidamus of Sparta as well as to Philip of Macedon....

The former quotation is from Dr. George Norlin's translation of Isocrates in The Loeb Classical Library, the latter comes from Professor Ernest Barker's chapter on Greek Political Thought and Theory in the Fourth Century, in The Cambridge Ancient History². Clearly these two scholars cannot both be right. It is the purpose of this paper briefly to review some of the available evidence. This done, it should be impossible to doubt which of the judgments just cited is correct.

We may begin with a general observation. It is an indisputable fact that from 387 to his death in 338 Isocrates was the teacher of a very large number of students. A late biographer^{3a} speaks of them as about one hundred; in all probability he has taken into account only those thought worthy of enumeration by the third century writer Hermippus, and the total of Isocrates's pupils may well have been far greater. The normal period of pupilage was three to four years; the study of contemporary politics and affairs

¹This paper was read at the Annual Meeting of the American Historical Association, held at Indianapolis, in December, 1928.

²See George Norlin, Isocrates, With an English Translation, I, xlii-xlv (London and New York [1928]); Ernest Barker, The Cambridge Ancient History 6, 518 (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1927). The chapter in which the quoted passage occurs occupies pages 503-535). <Dr. Norlin is President of the University of Colorado. C. K.>.

^{3a}Pseudo-Plutarch, De Decem Oratoribus 9.

was an important part of the curriculum. Thus the political views of the teacher must have thoroughly impregnated the minds of the disciples. Is it conceivable that the tenets of such a teacher should have remained without influence, even if none of the pupils had subsequently engaged in public affairs? As a matter of fact, many of them did afterwards play a prominent part in politics. It was no mere rhetorical flourish when Cicero wrote³, Isocratis e ludo tamquam ex equo Troiano innumeri principes exierunt.

Isocrates's first great political utterance was the Panegyricus, published in 380. Was it merely a literary masterpiece whose ideas were utopian and divorced from practical politics, or had it a practical aim? I do not think that there can be any doubt on this subject. The political situation in Greece was such that any pronouncement on Hellenic affairs must necessarily be cautiously framed. Sparta had, so to speak, a strangle-hold on the rest of Hellas. She had made peace with Persia and could rely on the backing of the Great King, if the terms of the King's Peace should be infringed, at any rate to her detriment. Her real or potential enemies in the Peloponnesus and beyond had been, or were in process of being, crushed. She had troops in Boeotia and had seized the citadel of Thebes. Finally, she had formed alliances with Dionysius of Syracuse and with Amyntas of Macedon. If any attempt was to be made to break down the dominant position of Sparta by the formation of an anti-Spartan coalition, it was needful to arouse public opinion in Greece. At the same time criticism of Sparta must be indirect and in veiled terms. When we turn to the Panegyricus, we find in fact a little praise of Sparta mixed with a great deal of hostility and not a little outspoken condemnation of her past conduct. What Isocrates hoped to achieve was the formation of a new maritime confederacy under Athenian leadership. A better check on Sparta could not be devised, and we must remember that Isocrates was reviving a project which had been tried in 390 under the guidance of Thrasylus, but had collapsed on the death of that statesman, followed, as it soon was, by the Peace of Antalcidas.

There is no doubt that Isocrates's powerful plea did much to rehabilitate Athens in the eyes of her former allies. Only two years after the publication of the Panegyricus the Second Athenian Confederacy came into being, and for a time flourished exceedingly. It was Timotheus, the pupil and intimate friend of Isocrates, who took a leading part in its organization and who did more than any other man to enlarge its membership. It is impossible to ascertain whether the isolated statement in the pseudo-Plutarch⁴, that Isocrates accompanied Timotheus on some of his

³De Oratore 2,22.

⁴De Decem Oratoribus 9.

visits to different city-states and drafted his despatches to Athens for him, is correct or not. Nor does it affect the main point, which is that a programme eloquently outlined by Isocrates was carried into effect by a man steeped in Isocratean doctrines.

Isocrates's further plan, a united Greek attack on Persia, was one which he first voiced in the Panegyricus and consistently advocated throughout his life. In part this was because he saw in the following of a common purpose a means of holding together a Greek federation, once it had been formed; in part it was due to his strong dislike of the oriental power. Ardent advocate of pan-Hellenic unity, as he is, and fully alive to the suicidal particularism of the Greek city-states, he is at the same time intensely intolerant of the 'barbarians'. Aristotle had much more understanding of the non-Hellenic peoples. But then Aristotle was not a citizen of what had been an imperial state, and what still was the cultural leader of Hellas. Isocrates has been called a pacifist. He is that only so far as the city-states of the Hellenic World are concerned.

The quarter of a century which followed the publication of the Panegyricus must have been a period of sad disillusionment for Isocrates. True, Lacedaemonian domination in Greece was checked, but Sparta's triumphant rival, Thebes, was as unscrupulous in her means and as narrowly selfish in her aims as ever Sparta had been. Worst of all, the maritime confederacy gradually ceased to be a true *συμμαχία*, and the history of the Delian Confederacy was re-enacted in miniature. Athens's abuse of her position as leader of the League brought its own punishment. The war with her allies, in which she was involved from 357 to 355, all but ended the maritime confederacy, and in addition left Athens exhausted financially and in other ways. In the year before she was forced to make peace Isocrates published his treatise On the Peace, and in 355 his Areopagiticus. The two works are complimentary each to the other. While the former is a plea not only for peace and the abandonment by Athens of all imperialist ambitions, but also for a true maritime *συμμαχία*, the latter advocates a drastic reform of Athenian democratic institutions and a return to the ancestral constitution of the early fifth century. It is well known that there are some striking resemblances in tone between the De Pace and Xenophon's tract on the revenues of Athens. The latter is wholly concerned with restoring the shattered finances of Athens, a result which Xenophon would bring about primarily by finding new sources of revenue. Isocrates, too, is not oblivious of this important aspect of a peace policy. He hopes to achieve the necessary solvency, to be followed by a revival of material prosperity, by retrenchment and by freedom from war expenditure, and as the natural result of settled conditions, without having recourse to innovations. In De Pace 20-21 he says,

'If we make peace, we shall administer our city in security, able to enjoy a respite from property taxes and trierarchies, and the other liabilities which war brings with it; we shall be able to cultivate farms in

safety, and sail the sea, and attend to our other vocations.... We shall see our city receiving double the revenues that she now receives, we shall see her filled with merchants, foreigners, and denizens, by whom she is now deserted'.

That Isocrates's views, especially his proposed constitutional changes, were distasteful to many is clear from his references in the Antidosis to attacks made upon him. But at least a part of what he advocated in the De Pace, peace and retrenchment, was precisely what Eubulus carried through in the next few years. It is arguable that that policy was wrong, spineless, if you will, in face of the difficulties of Olynthus and the aggressions of Philip; but, at all events, it cannot be said fairly that Isocrates was out of all touch with the realities of the political situation, when we see Eubulus carrying through a programme with which Isocrates must have been in sympathy.

I pass over the Philippus, published in 346, because I think it impossible to ascertain how far the Macedonian king was influenced by the Athenian thinker. I believe myself that that influence was far from inconsiderable, but belief is not proof. Isocrates himself shortly before his death said in a letter (Epistle 3), the genuineness of which has been quite needlessly questioned,

'There are many who have inquired of me whether it was I who counselled you to conduct the expedition against Persia, or whether I merely agreed with you when you formed that plan. I declare that I do not know the truth—I have had no meeting with you in the past—, yet I say that I believe you decided on these plans, and my plans coincided with your wishes'.

Isocrates's last long work, the Panathenaicus, begun in 342 but not published till 339, is, on a superficial reading, a rather diffuse panegyric on Athens, as well as a defense of Isocrates himself. But there are striking similarities of thought between it and the Philippus, which show that Isocrates had the cause of Hellenic unity just as much at heart then as in 380, and that he still looked to Philip to lead a united Hellas. The striking, and for the purpose of the present argument the important, matter is that a number of the provisions framed by the League of Corinth, which was called into being before the end of 338 by Philip's action, agree closely with the suggestions put forward by Isocrates in more general terms, especially in the Philippus and the Panathenaicus. The autonomy of the constituent members of the League, the banning of wars between city-states and the reference of possible disputes between members to the federal congress, prohibition to the Greek *poleis* or their citizens to enter the service, as mercenaries or otherwise, of the Great King, measures to prevent attacks on Hellenic cities by political exiles or by bodies of homeless mercenaries are some of the steps which Isocrates had advocated and which in more precise terms the League laid down for its guiding principles.

So far we have considered the relation of Isocrates's views to certain definite policies known to have been followed in fourth century Hellas. Is there any evidence that Isocrates, apart from the case of Timotheus, already cited, exerted influence by his teaching or

by his writing on individual politicians? Let it be admitted that such an inquiry is difficult and somewhat disappointing. The reason for this is simple: for the first half of the fourth century we lack material from which to construct a clear picture of the intricacies of Athenian party politics. Later on we have the utterances of Demosthenes; but, apart from those of Aeschines, the public speeches of members of the Peace or pro-Macedonian Party are lost. Even so, some significant parallels may be briefly indicated. Some of the views put in the mouth of Callistratus by Xenophon in his account of the peace congress of 371 accord very nearly with views expressed by Isocrates in the *Panegyricus* and a few years later in the *Plataicus*⁵. The Athenian statesman demands a true observance of the King's Peace and insists on autonomy for all Greek states. At the same time his criticisms of Spartan conduct, if brief, are no less heartfelt than those of Isocrates. The *Plataicus* was a plea that Athens should take up the cause of the oppressed and dispossessed Plataeans. At the peace congress of 371 the Athenian representatives espoused the cause of that city and of Thespiae. There is much that is attractive and probable in the view of a French scholar⁶, that the *Plataicus* was a piece of propaganda, having, besides its general championship of Athens's small but ancient ally, the special purpose of drawing attention to the danger threatening the rest of Greece from the ambitions of Thebes.

When we pass to the last decade of Greek independence, we can point to a number of sentiments expressed by Aeschines in his speech, *On the False Embassy*, which seem to echo Isocratean sentiments. Both put the blame for the political situation early in 346 as much as possible on the Thebans. The pleas used by Aeschines to Philip, in which he recalled the services rendered by Athens to Amyntas, urged the king to act toward the Greeks with restraint and generosity, and even made a short incursion into Greek legend, irresistibly recall the similar, if more elaborated, arguments in the *Philippus*. Aeschines's speech was delivered and published in 343, three years after the appearance of Isocrates's pamphlet. Whether the resemblances are the result of direct borrowing by Aeschines or are due merely to the fact that both writers were pro-Macedonian in their outlook—there were many other such whose speeches have perished—is really immaterial. In either case Isocrates is absolved from the charge of being a visionary and a weakling out of touch with the times in which he lived.

What of the lesser politicians of Greece? There are several certain, and a number of possible, Isocratean pupils among them. Such certainly was Leodamas of Acharnae, who is praised both by Demosthenes and by Aeschines as an orator. He was one of the accusers of Callistratus in 366, and later was opposed to Demosthenes in the Leptines affair. Clearchus, tyrant of

⁵See Xenophon, *Hellenica* 6. 3.10-16; Isocrates, *Panegyricus* 75-137, especially the summing-up in 129-137. In the *Plataicus* the important passage for our purpose is 17-26, with its warning that Thebes was aiming at the same kind of domination as that previously exercised by Sparta.

⁶See Georges Mathieu, *Les Idées Politiques d'Isocrate*, 93-94 (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1925. Pp. 228).

Heraclea Pontica, had been Isocrates's pupil for several years. One wonders whether his tyranny was the perverted outcome of Isocratean teaching on monarchy. Another name is that of Python of Byzantium or Aenus, who entered the service of Philip II, and in due course was sent as Macedonian envoy to Athens. One further disciple of Isocrates is of special interest. Hieronymus was one of the founders of Megalopolis, and subsequently was prominent in the affairs of that town. His policy later was one of friendship toward Philip; this philo-Macedonianism may well have been engendered largely by the political teaching of his former master. He is one of the twelve politicians belonging to various cities and friendly to Philip against whom Demosthenes launched a bitter indictment (*De Corona* 295) and in whose defence Polybius (18.14), a century and a half later, entered a no less emphatic plea. The other eleven—from Arcadia, Messenia, Argos, Thessaly, and Boeotia—are virtually unknown save for their mention in these two authors. Is it too rash a surmise that there were some Isocrateans among them?

We may end, as we began, with a general observation. When the ardent Platonist, Dr. Barker, waves aside Isocrates as of no account, does he not forget that Isocrates is the one recorded thinker of the fourth century who correctly divined the future of Hellenism? In a famous, nay a hackneyed passage (*Panegyricus* 50), Isocrates says,

'So far has our city outstripped the remainder of mankind in wisdom and eloquence that her pupils have become the teachers of the rest of the world; and it is the work of Athens that it is no longer race but intellectual ability that is implied in the name Hellenes, and that Hellenes are not so much those who are sprung from a common stock as those who are partakers of our culture.'

The Hellenistic Age saw the real fulfilment of what in 380 was still only a partial truth and a prophecy. But in a half century devoted to teaching and writing Isocrates more than any other man prepared men's minds for the new era brought to birth by the genius of Alexander.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

M. L. W. LAISTNER

REVIEWS

A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours. Studies in the Script of Tours, Number 1. By Edward Kennard Rand. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Mediaeval Academy of America (1929). Volume I, Text (Pages xxi + 245), Volume II, 200 Collotype Plates. \$50 (\$45 to members of The Mediaeval Academy of America).

A hearty welcome awaits Professor Rand's book, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours: palaeographers, historians of art, textual critics, students of classical literature, students of medieval literature, and students of medieval history will find it packed with valuable information. It deals comprehensively, if concisely, with what was undoubtedly the most important center of writing in the Middle Ages, the center whose script reached "a level of calligraphic*

art unsurpassed... in the annals of writing¹ and played a leading part in the evolution of the Caroline minuscule, which eventually triumphed over its rivals, gave way for a while to the Gothic, was revived by the humanists, and has persisted down to the present day. The book is the product of eighteen years of loving study, a period that has borne considerable fruit and fruit of worth. All will rejoice to know that it is to be followed by further volumes on the same subject².

While there has been no dearth of articles and books on specific aspects or particular manuscripts of Tours, there has appeared no work to summarize adequately the general trend in the development of the script. Professor Rand's book therefore meets a definite want. It aims to present a fairly complete picture of the history of Tours 'hands' from the seventh century (the earliest period for which records are available) through the ninth century (when the art of Tours reached its zenith), and an outline sketch of such 'hands' from the tenth through the twelfth century. It is modestly described by the author as falling short of his ideal history. He says (Preface, x),

... I should prefer to master the entire material first and to adjust my conclusions to those presented by Köhler³ in his forthcoming work, I thought it well, after all, to include a brief and prefatory account of all the books of Tours, with illustrated plates, as a survey of the entire field of my researches and as a stimulus to further investigation by others, in case I could not continue it myself....

Would that other palaeographers might provide us with parallel treatments of other schools of writing (Dr. Lowe has done it for the Beneventan script⁴). Such surveys are absolutely essential to progress in scholarship.

The scope of Professor Rand's book is best revealed by a listing of its contents. Part A, On the History of the Script of Tours, contains four chapters (3-78), as follows:

- I. A Brief Account of the Libraries at Tours (3-7);
- II. Characteristics of the Script of Tours and its Importance in the General History of Script (8-9);
- III. Details in the Description of the Books of Tours—Dimensions, Ruling, Gatherings, Signatures, Abbreviations, Punctuation, Text (10-31);
- IV. A Brief Account of the Development of the Script of Tours (32-78), <in twelve periods>, I. The Earliest Books of Tours (32-33), II. The Irish at Tours (34-35), III. The Pre-alcuinian Style (35-38), IV. The Reforms of Alcuin (38-45), IV.A. The Embellished Merovingian Style (45-48), IV.B. The Regular Style (49-52).
- V. The Régime of Fridugisus (53-60), VI. The Mid-century (60-63), VII. The Post-Mid-century Style (63-66), VIII. Tours and the Franco-Saxon Style (66-68), IX. The End of the Century (68-73), X. The Tenth Century (73-75), XI. The Eleventh Century (75), XII. The Twelfth Century (76-78).

Part B contains A Summary Description of the Manuscripts of Tours (81-202), arranged according

¹So E. A. Lowe, in *The Legacy of the Middle Ages*, 217 (in the chapter entitled Handwriting [197-226]). The book was edited by C. G. Crump and E. F. Jacob, and was published by the Oxford University Press, in 1926.

²The next volume will deal particularly with the earliest books of Tours.

³Wilhelm Köhler, *Karolingische Miniaturen*, the first volume of which will be on the School of Tours.

⁴E. A. Loew (later, Lowe), *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford University Press, 1914).

to the periods enumerated above (together with several groups of manuscripts doubtfully ascribed to Tours), and a List of Manuscripts Examined and Rejected (203-206). Then follow an Index of Manuscripts (209-217) with a Table of the Books of St. Gatian's, St. Martin's and Marmoutier (218), an Index of Plates (219-225), an Index of Authors and Works (227-231), and, finally, a General Index (233-245).

The second volume consists of two hundred superb collotype plates (12 x 16 inches), some divided into several parts—a princely treasure of script and illumination.

Actual defects in the arguments of this work are conspicuous by their absence. Of course there are several points—important points—of a more or less controversial nature. Not every scholar, for example, will admit the existence of an Irish Period at Tours (34-35). Not everyone will grant that Alcuin played so large a part in reforming the script (38-45). Not everyone, again, will hold that the Caroline minuscule is a lineal descendant of the cursive (41). Nor will all readily confess the presence of a Franco-Saxon influence on Tours (66-68). These problems, however, are set forth with such honesty and tolerance that the author's position will convince many and influence practically the whole body of readers.

The excellence of Professor Rand's work lies largely in its evenness of treatment. It is nevertheless possible to cite two or three points which seem of particular value, e.g. the inclusion (10) of the dimensions of the space occupied by the script of each manuscript, "which does represent the original conditions and which can be of importance in determining whether two parts of a modern volume were originally two different manuscripts...", and the restatement in terms remarkably clear (11-18) of the Old Style, New Style, and "outside-inside" methods of ruling manuscripts (originally expounded in *Palaeographia Latina* 5 [1925], 52-78, but apparently not yet generally appreciated by palaeographers). Much more important is Professor Rand's definition of the regular script of Tours (41): ... The essence of the Regular script of Tours, therefore, is primarily the systematic cultivation of all the varieties and the systematic distinction of them on the basis of ancient models so far as these existed. No other school, to the best of my knowledge, carried these reactions against cursive so far. No other school so carefully distinguished the sorts of majuscule; the general tendency elsewhere was to cultivate a mixed majuscule, in which the forms of square capital, rustic capital, and uncial were used at pleasure. No other school was so hospitable to semiuncial. The studied use of semiuncial is indeed one of the ear-marks of the script of Tours, but it is only one element in a many-sided programme.

The descriptions in Part B of the different manuscripts of Tours are summary and so much the more useful for reference on that account. Still one could wish for ampler statements in some places, statements which will be forthcoming for certain books at least in the subsequent volumes in this series. The author cautions us in his Preface (xii-xiii) that his descriptions are not so complete as his material permitted, that he has supplied only general accounts for

gatherings, signatures, script, abbreviations, and punctuation (but a thoroughgoing statement for rulings), that he has refrained on principle from discussing the text of any book, that he has included merely a few items on illumination, and, finally, that he has supplied in his bibliographies only the most important discussions of a book and the facsimiles available elsewhere. A description usually supplies the following information: the name of the manuscript, its contents, the number and the dimensions of the leaves (and of the fly-leaves), the number and the dimensions of the columns, the number of lines of script per page (or column), the ruling, signatures, script, abbreviations, illuminations, list of plates, and a selected bibliography.

Not the least attractive feature of Professor Rand's book is its format. The text volume is of a convenient size; it is printed in large, plain type (may its tribe increase!), on good paper; its contents are logically disposed; it has satisfactory analytical indices. Few errors appear to deface the work; in fact, I have noted but two of any importance: the omission of '*essel*...
-*eet* (with or without dots)' from the list of "Regular Abbreviations" in the manuscripts of Tour (27), and the word "latter's" instead of "former's" on page 202, next to the last paragraph. The plates deserve no end of praise. When they are occasionally reduced in size, Professor Rand notes this fact in the descriptions in Volume I.

Not only will this work be indispensable to scholars in many fields, but it will be bound to encourage further researches. Students will be dull indeed if they fail to be inspired by such direct challenges as Professor Rand utters at various points throughout his volume. Let us hope that ere long investigators will eagerly examine the manuscripts of Tours of the tenth to the twelfth century (viii), the chronology of Alcuinian Bibles (xii), and of "Martinellus" manuscripts (xiii), the "outside-inside" method of ruling (16), and the large subject of the influence of Tours on other scriptoria (9), not to mention a host of problems either specifically mentioned or implied⁵.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
BERKELEY

LESLIE WEBBER JONES

Hannibal Crosses the Alps. By Cecil Torr. Cambridge: At the University Press (1924). Pp. viii + 39¹.

<⁴As the proud possessor, by purchase, of Professor Rand's splendid volumes I wish to congratulate him and to thank him for what he has done for scholars in this great work. It is unfortunate that the price is so high, but the cost of producing the work must have been enormous.

I trust I shall be forgiven for making a comment or two—not by way of criticism, but by way of suggestion with respect to similar works to be published by the Medieval Academy.

First, I wish that one more Index had been given in Volume I—an Index listing the parts of authors and works represented in the Plates. Such an Index would, I am sure, have been heartily welcomed by every user of the work. Secondly, I wish that the legends beneath the Plates in Volume II had not been confined to the titles of the manuscripts. In a single additional line, or at most in two lines, very welcome information might have been given—a statement of the contents of the Plate. This statement should have given the name of the author and should have named, exactly, the piece of his work represented in the Plates. C. K. >

<⁵In 1925, Mr. Torr brought out, through the same publishers, a second edition of his booklet (Pp. viii + 64). This he calls a "Second Edition With a Counterblast Against Critics". The "Counterblast" (41-64) Mr. Torr in his Preface (viii) calls "an appendix". C. K. >

Where Hannibal Passed. By Arthur Rivers Bonus. With Twelve Illustrations and a Map. London: Methuen and Co. (1925). Pp. viii + 88.

One of the most perplexing problems presented by antiquity is, What was Hannibal's Route over the Alps? Livy (21.38.6), near the dawn of the first century of our era, expressed surprise at there being a controversy as to where Hannibal crossed the Alps. What would have been his surprise had he seen the vast array of scholars in the last century championing different routes and had he known that even in our day Hannibal's route is still a controversial question! However, our surprise is not so great: we have seen how many are the difficulties topographical, chronological, and metrological presented by the two leading ancient authorities, Polybius and Livy, and the host of controversies that have been caused thereby.

In general, the relative importance assigned to Polybius and Livy by a writer has determined largely, if not entirely, the view adopted and advocated by him. Up to times quite recent Polybius was decisively preferred, but modern scholarship has been more just to Livy. It is going too far to say that Polybius has fallen from his lofty pedestal, but this at least is true: confidence in him as the supreme authority has been shaken. So e. g. in 1911 W. Warde Fowler declared², "... In all essential attributes of a Roman historian Livy is far the better of the two..."; in 1913 J. S. Reid affirmed³, "...One tendency that has grown in my case with years is to lower my estimate of Polybius as an authority and to raise my opinion of Livy..."; and in 1921 Professor R. S. Conway asserted⁴, "...modern research...has vindicated the good faith and sound judgment with which Livy has interpreted, so far as he could, a tradition well attested but almost wholly devoid of local names..." From such scholars Mr. Torr differs widely. In his opening sentence he strikes this key-note: "Polybius, of course, is far the best authority..." To this statement Mr. Bonus, however, takes exception (8): "We see, then, that so far from Polybius, III, 39 being an essential factor in the problem under consideration, it is one that not only may, but actually must, be excluded...". Later (11), he adds, "...Once this is eliminated, the problem becomes not more soluble, but almost easy⁵".

Until recently the opinion generally held has been that Hannibal crossed by the Little St. Bernard ("supported by Polybius"⁶), though the Mont Genèvre route

¹The Religious Experience of the Roman People, 316 (London, Macmillan, 1911).

²Journal of Roman Studies, 1913, 170.

³New Studies of a Great Inheritance, 199 (London, Murray, 1921; see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.210-211).

⁴In Chapters I and II Mr. Bonus has subjected Polybius 3.30 to a critical examination, particularly his measurements, his reference to 'Narbonne' (bracketed in The Loeb Classical Library version of Polybius), and other discrepancies. He concludes (4), "...we are justified in regarding the chapter as non-Polybian..."

⁵On page 20 Mr. Bonus discusses Polybius's much quoted statement (3.48.12) of his superior qualifications, contending that "...It is however practically certain that he did not follow it <= Hannibal's route> from end to end...". and adding, "He does not explicitly claim to have done so...". Thus falls one of the reasons advanced by some for giving precedence to Polybius.

⁶So e.g. Glanville Terrell, The Classical Journal, 17 (1922), 446-447, 503-504.

("supported by Livy")⁸) did not lack champions. In 1900, Wilhelm Osiander's book, *Hannibalweg*, appeared. In this book cogent reasons were advanced in favor of the Mont Cenis route. In reviewing this book I remarked⁹: "The drift of opinion in recent years seems to be away from the theory that Hannibal crossed *via* the Little St. Bernard . . ."¹⁰ Be that as it may, in 1911 Spenser Wilkinson, in *Hannibal's March Through the Alps*, and Paul Azan, in *Annibal dans les Alpes*, maintained that Hannibal crossed by the Col du Clapier¹¹ (adjacent to Mont Cenis), and in 1914 D. W. Freshfield, in *Hannibal Once More*, favored the Col d'Argentière (about 50 miles to the south). Between these two Cols lie the two passes advocated by Messrs. Torr and Bonus. Mr. Torr contends that Hannibal's route was up the Guil valley to Abriès and across the Col de la Traversette, or up the Ubaye valley and across the Col d'Argentière. Mr. Bonus, however, maintains that he went up the Cerveyrette Valley and down to Abriès over the Col de Malaure. It will not be possible to enter here into any detailed discussion of the various arguments advanced by these two authors. But it is important to note that both Mr. Torr and Mr. Bonus (as previously Osiander) emphasize the cardinal importance of the view of the plains about the Po, a striking feature both in Polybius's account and in Livy's. Mr. Torr is convinced (page 38, § 69) that "Whatever pass it was that Hannibal crossed, the summit must have commanded a wide view of the plain of the Po . . ." (compare also pages 25-26, § 48); he adds (page 38, § 70) that "one main point affecting the entire route" is Hannibal's need at this stage of his march to take the very shortest route, because ". . . The autumn was advancing; and it was a matter of life or death for Hannibal to complete his march before the snows had made the Alps impassable . . ." Mr. Bonus, who is in perfect accord (44) with Mr. Torr's view of the "view", makes this significant and characteristic remark (59): ". . . I visited several other passes in the Abriès region, simply to satisfy myself that they did not correspond to the classical texts . . ." Such a method of procedure must commend itself to everyone. Furthermore, such expressions as (44), ". . . On July 23, 1924, I walked up to it", (52) ". . . I myself walked up to the

⁸So A. D. Godley, *The Classical Review* 39 (1925), 33. According to Mr. Bonus (13-14), Hannibal had originally planned to cross by Mont Genève, going up the Isère to Grenoble, thence to Briançon, but at this place "he was led astray by the local guides . . ." and finally found his way to Abriès and to the Col de Malaure. On page 63 (compare also 52), he says that Polybius's word, *leukopetron* (3.53), "must mean, and be translated, 'open stony place', or something of the kind . . .".

⁹For my review of Osiander's treatise see *The American Journal of Philology* 22, 453-454.

¹⁰One often hears that Polybius's statement (3.56.4), to the effect that Hannibal "descended into the territory of the Insubres", is decisive for the passage over the Little St. Bernard, but little is said of his later remark (3.60.8) about the Taurini who live at the foot of the mountains. Attention is therefore called to Mr. Torr's statement (pages 11-12, § 22), ". . . <Hannibal> may have come down into territory which then belonged to the Insubres but afterwards belonged to the Taurini . . .", a very pertinent remark! Furthermore, as A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb remark (in their translation of Livy 21-25, 331 [London, Macmillan, 1883]), Livy (1890), 331) ". . . The geography of the district was in his <Polybius's> day too indistinctly known for him to do this at all <i.e. fix the point at which, or near which, Hannibal entered Italy> . . ." Another important matter is called to our attention by Mr. Bonus (39-42) Ammianus Marcellinus's statement (15.10), *Taurinis ducentibus accolis*; this renders Livy's account (21.38.5) more plausible.

Col . . .", etc., produce confidence. In short, Mr. Bonus's careful study of the ancient authorities, his personal inspection of the various places along the line of march and of the various competing passes, all combined carry conviction, and so we are led to ask with him (77), ". . . Does, or does not, the Col de Malaure answer to all details of the specification given by Polybius and Livy?"¹¹ . . ., and are inclined to believe him when he says (77), ". . . No one who knows the pass can hesitate as to the reply . . .", especially when his declaration is buttressed by this statement (77), that, though he knows six of the Abriès passes, he knows no other that fits the descriptions as well¹².

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

EMORY B. LEASE

Josephus: *The Man and the Historian* (The Hilda Stich Stroock Lectures at The Jewish Institute of Religion). By H. St. John Thackeray, With a Preface by George Foot Moore. New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press (1929). Pp. ix + 160.

Dr. H. St. John Thackeray, the translator of Josephus in The Loeb Classical Library, and veteran student of the Septuagint, has given us in the volume under review a very readable account of the life and the writings of an important figure in the literary history of the first century, whose work is of interest to specialists in several fields.

Lecture I, *Life and Character of Josephus: Estimate of Value of his Works* (1-22), is a concise account, giving the traditional facts. Dr. Thackeray criticizes his author as a time-server and plagiarist, but praises the spirit and the patriotism of his work, *Contra Apionem*. There is perhaps more polemic than one should expect in a lecture, but the views of Dr. Richard Laqueur, often cited only to be refuted, help our understanding of the subject.

Lecture II, *The "Jewish War"* (23-50), praises the style of that composition, and suggests that parallelisms to the fifth book of the Histories of Tacitus are due to the common use by both writers of Commentaries on the war composed by Vespasian and Titus. A principal source for *The Jewish War* was the history of Nicolas of Damascus, the intimate friend of Herod the Great and of the Emperor Augustus.

Lecture III, the "Jewish Antiquities" (51-74), points out the influence of Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Josephus, and analyzes the sources of the several parts of the work. Dr. Thackeray makes the account of the death of Moses (*Antiquities* 4.326) dependent on Dionysius 1.64.4, where the passing of Aeneas and Romulus is described (see pages 57-58, 93). The similarity may well be accidental, however, for the traditions of the rabbis in regard to the death of Moses (*Menahot* 30, *Sotah* 13-14) could serve at least equally well as a model. Similarly, Josephus had precedent for "whitewashing" the discreditable incidents in

¹¹Note also 44: "As I climbed the final ascent I mentally reviewed the details in which the pass, if it really was Hannibal's pass, must correspond to the texts . . .".

¹²Osiander claims that the Mont Cenis route does this.

Scriptural history (58) in the example of the current Aramaic versions called Targumim.

In Lecture IV, *Josephus and Judaism: His Biblical Text* (75-99), Dr. Thackeray shows the importance of Josephus for the criticism of the text of the Septuagint. Lecture V, *Josephus and Hellenism: His Greek Assistants* (100-124), is Dr. Thackeray's best and most original chapter. On the basis of a minute examination of the language, which he made for his projected Lexicon to Josephus, Dr. Thackeray is able to make a plausible distinction between the *ipsissima verba* of Josephus himself and the work of his two principal assistants, one of whom he terms the "Thucydidean hack" and the other the "Poet-lover". The chapter may serve as an introduction to the methods of Higher Criticism. Dr. Thackeray pleasantly suggests (100) that we ought to do justice by speaking of "Josephus and Co." as authors of writings commonly ascribed to Josephus alone.

In the sixth and last Lecture, *Josephus and Christianity* (125-153), Dr. Thackeray discusses the passages referring to Jesus and Christianity, *Antiquities* 18.63-64, 116-119, 20.197-203. He glances at the extensive literature on the authenticity of these passages (especially the first listed), and with some hesitation favors the view that they are Josephan, with certain alterations. In regard to the Slavonic materials recently brought to light for the study of Josephus¹, Dr. Thackeray professes himself incompetent to judge; he cites the views of Dr. Robert Eisler on the subject, with admiration if not with approval.

The Preface of Professor George Foot Moore, of Harvard University, commends (v-ix) the author's scholarship and fairness. There are a General Index (155-157) and an Index of Passages (158-160).

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

MOSES HADAS

SOLON AND CROESUS¹

Most of the essays that compose Mr. Alfred Zimmern's *Solon and Croesus* (Oxford University Press) were written, so he tells us, while he was gathering material for his Greek Commonwealth—before he turned, that is, from the writing of history to the making of it. They are characterized by the same happy combination of scholarship, philosophy, and literary grace that made the *Greek Commonwealth* one of the notable books of our generation. They are

¹With reference to these Slavonic materials see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 22.146. C. K. >

²This notice is reprinted from the periodical called New York, 3. 167-168 [October 9, 1929]. For this periodical see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 23.95, 103, Note 1.

The book under review is entitled *Solon and Croesus And Other Greek Essays* (Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. vii + 199). Its author, Alfred E. Zimmern, is well known for his work, *The Greek Commonwealth*. The contents of the book are as follows: Preface (v-vi); Introduction: Solon and Croesus (1-40); I. History as an Art (41-79); II. The Study of Greek History; III. Thucydides the Imperialist (81-104); IV. (i) Was Greek Civilization Based on Slave Labour? (105-132); V. (ii) Was Greek Civilization Based on Slave Labour? (133-163); VI. Suggestions Towards a Political Economy of the Greek City-State (165-199).

The author of the notice of the book here reprinted is a member of the Department of History of New York University. It is well worth while to see, from time to time, that there are persons not professionally connected with the Classics to whom the Classics still make appeal. C. K. >

permeated, too, by that admiration of Athenian civilization common to almost all students of antiquity....

The spell that ancient Greece casts over her lovers is no transient or evanescent one, and though Mr. Zimmern has long given his energies and talents to the promotion of internationalism, he returns continually to his first love to sing her beauties, to drink again at her unquenchable fountains of wisdom, and to renew his faith in humanity.

The title essay of the volume, *Solon and Croesus*, is a penetrating discussion of what Mr. Zimmern denominates the "central problem of twentieth-century civilization."

In the civilization of ancient Greece men lived in houses of mud brick, but Solon spoke to Croesus not only as equal but as master. Today Croesus is king, in fact, if not in name, and the successors of Solon, no longer lawgivers, count themselves happy if they are not his hirelings².

Mr. Zimmern finds no simple explanation for this reversal of rôles, nor any easy solution to the problem it presents, but his sober presentation of our present situation and his uncompromising insistence upon intellectual and spiritual integrity remind us that the question of Solon and Croesus, of God and Mammon, is as acute as ever....

Of the remaining essays in the volume, "History as an Art," "The Study of Greek History," "Thucydides the Imperialist," and "Was Greek Civilization Based on Slave Labour?" the latter two are particularly significant. It is difficult indeed to say anything new about Thucydides or about the Funeral Oration, but Mr. Zimmern's analysis is unusually suggestive and penetrating, and his criticism of the one failing of the great Greek historian particularly pertinent <103-104>:

When you have read those proud and stirring pages in which he describes the sailing of that biggest and most expensive fleet that ever left the shores of Greece, when you have listened to the blare of trumpets and watched the triremes racing across the bay to Aegina . . . then you will realize that Thucydides was after all but a Periclean, that the insight of Euripides and the wisdom of Plato were beyond him. If he had joined those to what he has given us, I do not know where we should look for his equal.³

The lengthy essay on the moot question of the rôle of slave labour in Greek civilization has a greater pertinence and interest than the title might suggest. It is primarily a scholarly résumé and criticism of the earlier literature on the subject and a reinterpretation of the term "slave labor," but its conclusions cannot be without interest to every student of American Negro slavery, and to every thoughtful observer of the rôle and destiny of labor in our present industrial organization.

There is a quality about Mr. Zimmern's scholarship that gives to every problem it touches a freshness and a relevance and a universality....

HENRY STEELE COMMAGER

¹This 'quotation' is given exactly as it stands in New York. Evidently neither author of the article nor the editor of New York compared the quotation with the original [page 3]. C. K. >

²This quotation, too, is inaccurate. C. K. >

ACTUS HOMERICUS

The Classics contributed part of their share in the celebration of the Sacerdotal Jubilee of our Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, at the Novitiate of Saint Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, New York, when on Sunday afternoon, December 15, the graduating class of that Jesuit house of classical studies presented an Actus Homericus. The entire student body, the Faculty, and many invited guests, both clerical and lay, crowded the College Auditorium.

The Actus, or Defense, is one of the distinctive features of the Ratio Studiorum, the Jesuit system of teaching¹.

The programme opened with the singing in Greek, by the Juniors' Choir, of the first strophe and anti-strophe of Pindar's First Pythian Ode. This ode, composed in 474 B. C., was discovered in a monastery near Messina, in Sicily, in 1648, by a famous Jesuit scholar, Father Athanasius Kircher. The music assigned to it is according to the arrangement of the most eminent authority on Greek music, Dr. Albert Wilhelm Thierfelder, of the University of Rostock.

Next came the Actus Homericus, in which Mr. Philip H. O'Neill "presented the Iliad and the Odyssey for Translation, Critical Analysis, Historical Exposition, and Literary Appreciation". Three other members of the graduating class, all from the Middle Atlantic States, in turn objected on historical, literary, and critical grounds to various aspects of the Homeric Poems. These objections were based mainly on the principles of Aristotle and his contemporaries. Mr. James I. Conway presented objections against the unity of the epic, both internal and external. Mr. John J. Horrigan argued on the literary and historical aspects of the Odyssey, and Mr. John J. McKeane elected to impugn the character of Achilles and to maintain that he was not the proper type of hero for an epic. All four participants in the Actus are graduates of Jesuit High Schools.

As soon as these objectors had concluded their part, the invited guests and several members of the Faculty proposed difficulties to Mr. O'Neill in connection with various phases of the Homeric epics. Not only did Mr. O'Neill satisfactorily dispose of all the difficulties, but his exhibition of general classical knowledge and erudition delighted the appreciative audience.

Then followed another selection in Greek by the Juniors' Choir, the Hymn to Apollo. Written in 278 B. C., on the marble slabs of the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, it was discovered there in 1893, and edited by Dr. Thierfelder, in 1898. This hymn is the most satisfactory specimen we have of ancient Greek music, being undoubtedly genuine and apparently more complete than any other that has been preserved to us. Its rhythm is peculiar, having five beats to each measure throughout. This form, though hardly ever used in modern music, has a charm all its own. The melody of the hymn has a much wider range and more variety than that of the First Pythian Ode of Pindar.

¹For some remarks on the Ratio Studiorum see a paper by the Rev. James J. Cahill, S. J., on Latin Composition in Jesuit High Schools, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 7:74-77. C. K. >

Greater freedom and modulation, and an evident attempt to reflect the meaning of the words show that a decided advance in musical expression had been made in the course of the two centuries that elapsed between the composition of the two pieces rendered by the Juniors' Choir.

The programme closed with the singing of the Star Spangled Banner, in Greek, by the entire audience. The Greek translation was made by one of the Jesuits.

ALOYSIUS J. HOGAN, S. J., Dean

PRESIDENT BUTLER ON ATHENS AND ROME

On October 31, 1929, a Convocation was held at Columbia University as the final act in the celebration of the 175th Anniversary of "The Passing of the Seals" of that institution. The concluding address was delivered by President Nicholas Murray Butler. Part of that Address, whose title was *Ave Mater Immortalis*, is reproduced here.

The highest places of this earth are not the most elevated. They are rather those which the human spirit has seized upon as capitals of its loftiest endeavor, of its most persistent accomplishments and of its most commanding and compelling ideals.

Go with me in imagination to the four most sacred and most inspiring spots in the world—to the summit of the Mount of Olives, to the Acropolis at Athens, to the Capitoline Hill at Rome and to that gently sloping height in the city of Paris which bears the name of Sainte Geneviève. From each and all of these four elevations one looks down upon an expanse of territory, not wide, but crowded beyond belief with incident, with association, with happening, with prophecy and with memory. Great space is not needed for great thoughts or great deeds....

Cross the short sea <from Jerusalem> to the Acropolis at Athens. Go out at sunset and sit with me on the corner of the temple of the Wingless Victory, that most beautiful and pathetic of ruins. Immediately in front is the scene of the battle of Salamis. Beyond the hills to the right the Persians were beaten back at Marathon. In that little grove of trees yonder, in the midst of the blue fields, were the Academy of Plato and the Lyceum of Aristotle. Under the hill to the left is the great theatre in which the most superb dramas of all time were read to the delight of the Athenian people. Just below is Mars' Hill, where the powerful voice of the Apostle Paul may even now almost be heard thundering out, "Ye men of Athens!" Beyond stands the very platform from which Demosthenes appealed to the Athenian people to beat back the Macedonian tyrant. All about us are broken symbols of that sculptor's art which has charmed and delighted the centuries. On this Acropolis is the center-spot and capital of the literature, the art and the eloquence of quite three thousand years.

But two days' travel to the west is the Capitoline Hill at Rome, which looks down upon the scene of so many marvelous events, the home of so many commanding men, all of whom live and move today in our literature, our art, our institutions and our life. Here Caesar came from beyond the Rubicon and walked to his death. Here Cicero and Cato raised their persuading voices, here poets, historians and nation-builders for century upon century lived and labored and died. On this hill is the capital of the modern world's order, the modern world's law and the modern world's government....

CHARLES KNAPP